

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05513 151846Z

51

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EA-11 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 EURE-00 H-03 ACDA-19

OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00 OMB-01 EB-11 DRC-01 /186 W  
----- 005204

P R 151705Z NOV 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2696

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3444

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY TOKYO

CONFIDENTIAL USNATO 5513

E.O. 11652: GDS, 12-31-79

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJ: ATLANTIC RELATIONS: SUMMARY IN ENGLISH OF AMBASSADOR

DE ROSE'S PRESENTATION ON FRENCH AMENDMENTS

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

1. FRENCH PERMREP DE ROSE LED OFF COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON  
ATLANTIC RELATIONS NOVEMBER 14 WITH DETAILED EXPLANATION OF  
THE AMENDMENTS CONTAINED IN THE FRENCH ATLANTIC DECLARATION  
DRAFT (USNATO 5444). FULL TEXT IN FRENCH OF DE ROSE'S  
PRESENTATION AND ALLIED REACTIONS WILL BE SENT SEPTELS.

2. DE ROSE SAID CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE ALLIES IN THE  
ORIGINAL FRENCH TEXT HAD GENERALLY COME UNDER TWO HEADINGS:  
THOSE DIRECTED AT OMISSIONS SUCH AS COVERAGE OF BURDEN  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05513 151846Z

SHARING FORCE REDUCTIONS AND THOSE DIRECTED TO MEET A CONCERN  
THAT THE EARLIER FRENCH VERSION WAS TOO DEFENSE-ORIENTED.  
THE FRENCH AGREED THAT LANGUAGE MEETING CONCERNS IN THE  
LATTER CATEGORY ADDED A "BIT OF WARMTH" TO THE DECLARATION.

HE HOPED THAT THE FRENCH SUGGESTIONS COVERING THSE POINTS  
WOULD MEET THE EXPECTATIONS OF ALL ALLIES.

3. IN TERMS OF DRAFTING STYLE, THE FRENCH HAD TRIED TO ADOPT  
SUBSTANCE OF ALLIED PROPOSALS WHILE MAINTAINIG COHERENCE  
OF STYLE IN TEXT. THEY HAD, THEREFORE, FREQUENTLY CHANGED  
LANGUAGE IN ALLIED SUBMISSIONS. FURTHER, THE FRENCH HAD  
RESISTED APPEALS FOR DIRECT CITATIONS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC  
TREATY FOR FEAR THAT QUOTING ONLY PART MIGHT LEAD OTHERS TO  
FEEL THAT UNQUOTED PASSAGES WERE BEING FORGOTTEN BY THE ALLIANCE.

4. DE ROSE MADE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON FRENCH CHANGES IN  
NUMBERED PARAGRPAHS:

-- ONE: DE ROSE HAD PREVIOUSLY SPOKEN TO CHANGES IN  
FIRST PARAGRAPH IN OCTOBER 24 NAC, VOLUNTEERING LANGUAGE  
TO ACCOMMODATE CANADIAN CONCERNRS.

-- TWO: CHANGES WERE PURELY EDITORIAL. THE FRENCH NOTED THE  
FRG INTEREST IN MENTIONING DETENTE NEGOTIATIONS OTHER THAN  
CSCE AND HAD MADE REFERENCE TO FORCE REDUCTIONS NOT IN PARA  
2 BUT IN PARA 9. THE FRENCH WERE UNABLE TO AGREE, HOWEVER,  
ON REFERENCES TO OTHER EAST/WEST NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH FRANCE  
WAS NOT A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. WITH REGARD TO TURKEY'S SUGGES-  
TION THAT JUSTIFICATION FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF ALLIED LINKS  
WAS ALSO BASED ON SOVIET POWER, DE ROSE SAID FRENCH DRAFTERS  
HAD REJECTED THIS PRINCIPLE PREFERRING TO SHOW THAT THE ALLIANCE  
WAS BASED ON BROADER FOUNDATIONS THAN FEAR OF THE SOVIET  
UNION.

-- THREE: DE ROSE NOTED EARLIER CANADIAN CHARACTERIZATION  
OF PARAGRAPH 3 AS "OBSCURE" AND HOPED NEW LANGUAGE WAS  
REMEDY. WITH REGARD TO OTTAWA'S QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE NEW  
CHARACTER OF EUROPEAN DEFENSE," DE ROSE EXPLAINED AGAIN  
FRENCH THEORY THAT, UNLIKE PERIOD WHEN MASSIVE RETALIATION WAS  
ALLIANCE STRATEGY, U.S., CANADA AND THE SOVIET UNION NOW ARE  
VULNERABLE ONLY TO STRATEGIC THREAT. EUROPE IS VULNERABLE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05513 151846Z

TO STRATEGIC ATTACK BUT ALSO TO OTHER FORMS OF CONVLICT  
(TACTICAL-NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS) AND EVEN TO  
GREATER POLITICAL PRESSURE IF IT FELT IT WOULD NOT BE DEFENDED  
BY ITS ALLIES. THESE ARE THE FACTORS WHICH GIVE A SPECIFIC  
CHARACTER TO EUROPEAN DEFENSE.

-- FOUR: FRENCH PERMREP RECOGNIZED ITALIAN PROBLEMS WITH  
REFERENCE TO U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES, "WHETHER THEY ARE BASED IN  
THE UNITED STATES OR IN EUROPE," SINCE THE LANGUAGE SEEMED TO  
CREATE DISTINCTIONS IN U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES WHEN INDEED ALL SUCH  
FORCES WERE IMPORTANT TO ALLIANCE SECURITY. DE ROSE SAID THE  
FRENCH DID NOT DISAGREE WITH ITALIAN OBSERVATION IN PRINCIPLE.  
FRENCH WANTED, HOWEVER, TO SHOW U.S. STRATEGIC FORCES ADDED TO

DETERRENCE EVEN IN A PERIOD OF EQUILIBRIUM. THIS DULY ALSO FIGURED IN THE AMERICAN TEXT OF LAST SUMMER.

-- FIVE: NEW LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 5 WAS TO REFLECT THE CONCEPT THAT EUROPEAN FORCES WERE AIMED NOT ONLY AT DETERRING BUT DEFEATING AGGRESSION IF IT OCCURED.

-- SIX: DE ROSE SAID THAT CHANGE IN PARAGRAPH 6 HAD BEEN DRAFTED TO MEET CANADIAN CONCERNS ABOUT DRAWING DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN EUROPEAN AND ATLANTIC DEFENSE AND THEREBY CHANGING INTENT OF ARTICLE V OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY. FRENCH CHANGES WERE ALSO INTENDED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT ALLIES' DEFENSE FORCES WERE AT THE SERVICE OF A POLITICAL CONCEPT WHICH WOULD DENY AN ADVERSARY NOT ONLY HIS MILITARY BUT ALSO HIS POLITICAL OBJECTIVES.

-- EIGHT: THE FRENCH WERE UNABLE TO RECONCILE IN THE REVISIONS GERMAN AND TURKISH SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING CONTRIBUTIONS THAT EEC MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS COULD MAKE TO DEFENSE.

-- NINE: DE ROSE SAID CHANGE IN PARAGRAPH 9 WAS DIRECTED AT MEETING REQUIREMENTS FOR COVERAGE OF BURDENSHARING AND FORCE REDUCTIONS IN THE REVISED TEXT. THE FRENCH AGREED THAT EACH OF THE ALLIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO BEAR THEIR FAIR SHARE OF THE DEFENSE BURDEN. FRENCH SAW AS THEIR DUTY THE MAINTENANCE OF FRENCH NATIONAL FORCES INCLUDING THE FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCE, ALTHOUGH OTHER MIGHT WISH FOR A DIFFERENT KIND

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 05513 151846Z

OF CONTRIBUTION SUCH AS THAT PREFERRED BY THE U.S. IN ANY EVENT, DE ROSE HOPED LANGUAGE WOULD MEET EVERYONE'S REQUIREMENTS SINCE HE COULD SEE NONE OTHER THAT WOULD BE SATISFACTORY TO PARIS. RE SUBPARA 2 OF PARAGRAPH 9, DE ROSE SAID THIS TOO WAS ALL FRENCH COULD ACCEPT IN REFERENCE TO FORCE REDUCTIONS.

-- TEN, ELEVEN, TWELVE: DE ROSE SAID THAT CHANGES IN THESE PARAGRAPHS OF THE FRENCH DRAFT WERE DIRECTED AT MEETING SUGGESTIONS MADE BY SEVERAL ALLIES. CHANGES IN ARTICLE X, FOR EXAMPLE, ARE TAKEN FROM THE EARLIER UK DRAFT AND FROM ARTICLE XI ATTEMPTED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DANES, DUTCH AND OTHERS FOR INCLUSION OF THOSE HIGHER IDEALS WHICH ARE ALSO FUNDAMENTAL ALLIANCE CONCEPTS. PARAGRAPH 12 HAD BEEN CASE TO MEET DUTCH REQUIREMENT FOR AN APPEAL TO ALLIANCE YOUTH. MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 15 NOV 1973  
**Decapton Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decapton Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05513  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS, 12-31-79  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731165/abqcedhy.tel  
**Line Count:** 158  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 21 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <21-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <03-Oct-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ATLANTIC RELATIONS: SUMMARY IN ENGLISH OF AMBASSADOR DE ROSE'S PRESENTATION ON FRENCH AMENDMENTS  
**TAGS:** PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
VIENNA  
EC BRUSSELS  
GENEVA  
TOKYO  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005